

REMARKS

Prior to further examination and in consideration of the final Office Action mailed July 29, 2005, applicants respectfully reconsideration in view of the remarks provided herein responsive to the statements in the Advisory Action mailed on October 18, 2005. This Submission supplements the Amendment and Reply filed September 28, 2005.

Reply to Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005

The Advisory Action notes that “there does not appear to be written description of the new limitation in the application as filed...However, the recited portion only discloses using the exposed information to build the process map and is silent as to whether the process is created automatically or not.”

Applicants note that the specification discloses that “[t]he engine is a *processing* unit...” (emphasis added). See page 7, line 9. The specification then further discloses that “node classes expose their capabilities in terms of business tasks to be completed....” See page 7, lines 15-16. The specification then discloses that “[t]he exposed information is used by the engine 2 to build the process map 15.” See page 7, lines 16-17 of the specification. This disclosure clearly discloses that the processing unit (which is an automated entity) builds (or creates) the processing map using the exposed capabilities of the node classes. This disclosure clearly supports the claimed limitation which requires that the process maps be automatically created (by an automated entity – the engine).

Accordingly, applicants submit that the originally filed specification provides adequate written description support for the features recited in the pending independent claims. It should be noted that “[t]he subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement.” See MPEP §2163.02.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the application in condition for allowance. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 31, 2005 (Monday)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5414

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants